

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-37, 39, 41, 42, 45-59, 61-79, 81-83, 85, 86, 90, 91, 95, 96, and 98-100 are pending in this application. Claims 60, 87-89, 92-94, 97, and 101-102 are canceled without prejudice by the present response. Claims 15-35, 39, 41, 42, 45-58, 63-65, 67-77, 79, 81-83, 85, 90, 95, and 100 are allowed. Claims 36, 37, 59, 61, 62, 66, 78, 86, 88, 89, 91, 93, 94, 96, 98, 99, 101, and 102 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the admitted art in view of U.S. patent 5,450,211 to Kanai et al. (herein “Kanai”). Claims 60, 87, 92, and 97 were objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were noted as allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of their base claims, and any intervening claims.

Initially, applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of the allowance and allowable subject matter.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 36, 37, 59, 61, 62, 66, 78, 86, 88, 89, 91, 93, 94, 96, 98, 99, 101, and 102 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the admitted art in view of Kanai, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

First, with respect to claims 36, 66, and 78, each of those claims is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, claim 36 clarifies that the temperature detecting device is “formed in said optical unit”; independent claims 66 and 78 are similarly amended. Such a feature is fully supported by the original specification, see for example Figure 20 showing the temperature detecting device 2004 formed in the optical unit 103. Such a feature also clearly distinguishes over the applied art.

More specifically, Kanai does not teach or suggest placing a temperature detecting device actually in an optical unit. As recognized in the Office Action, Kanai senses a temperature around an fθ lens utilizing a temperature sensor 28. Clearly in Kanai that

temperature sensor 28 is not "formed in said optical unit". In such ways, each of claims 36, 66, and 78, and the claims dependent therefrom, distinguish over the applied art.

With respect to the rejections to claims 59, 86, 91, and 96, those rejections are traversed by the present response as each of those claims is amended by the present response to recite subject matter indicated as allowable in the outstanding Office Action. More specifically, each of independent claims 59, 86, 91, and 96 is amended to incorporate the limitations of respective dependent claims 60, 87, 92, and 97, which subject matter was indicated as allowable in paragraph 4 of the outstanding Office Action. Thus, each of amended independent claims 59, 86, 91, and 96 is believed to be allowable.

Further, each of independent claims 88, 98, and 101, and the claims dependent therefrom, are canceled by the present response without prejudice, and thereby the rejection of those claims is obviated by the present response.

In view of these foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that each of the pending claims recites allowable subject matter.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
GJM/SNS/cja

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423  
Attorneys of Record